

REPORT ON KAWEAH PROJECT (UNIT 10)

RALPH HOPPING
SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.
JUNE 14, 1918

FILE COPY

FOREST INSECT LABORATORY,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

330.s2

^S
Insect Control
Sequoia

June 14, 1918.

R E P O R T

on

K A W E A H P R O J E C T (UNIT 10)

1 9 1 8

By: RALPH HOPPING
National Forest Examiner

Copy for J.M. Miller.

KAWEAH PROJECT (UNIT 10)

This project, known as Unit 10 in the 1917 Insect Control Survey Report, was worked jointly by the Sequoia National Park and the Forest Service between the dates of April 1 and May 20, 1918. Besides the control work, data was taken on the infestation, following out part of the plan known as the Ashland Conference Plan.

The administrative part of the work ^{was} in charge of Forest Examiner O. M. Evans and Ranger Lloyd Allen, while the technical part was taken care of by Mr. J. M. Miller and Albert Wagner of the Bureau of Entomology and Ralph Hopping of the Forest Service. The report of the entomological features of the project will be made by Mr. J. M. Miller.

Owing to the difficulty in transportation and the prevailing high prices for subsistence, transportation and labor, the cost of the work was much higher than similar work under ordinary circumstances. Another factor was also the difficulty in getting sufficient men to form the maximum number for an economic crew and the "unskilled" labor obtainable.

The selection of this area under the Ashland Conference Plan was partially due to its accessibility

from the outside or its proximity to regular transportation. It became evident, though, during the course of the work that this factor was of minor importance compared with the accessibility of the individual trees upon the area itself. In other words, an area easily traversed for checking purposes is preferable to one cut by the deep canyons of this project, even if it is more accessible to regular means of transportation. I would suggest that further selections of experimental areas under the Ashland Conference Plan should give consideration to this factor.

Results of Work.

1. Cost of Protection, ...	\$1,580.60
2. Cost per M.B.M. for Timber Treated, ^{4.13} ~~5.27~~	
3. Total B.M. of timber Cut, ...	382,700
	~~370,160~~ ft.
Yellow Pine ²⁰⁹⁵⁸⁰ ~~204,560~~	
Sugar Pine <u>169,020</u>	~~370,160~~ "
Jeffrey Pine 4100	382,700

Cost of Work.

1. Labor:	
Sequoia National Park, ...	\$623.87
Sequoia National Forest, ...	<u>545.50</u> \$1,169.37

(This includes \$100.00 salary of O. M. Evans and the wages of the cook.)

2. Transportation:

Sequoia National Park, ...	\$227.00	
Sequoia National Forest, ...	<u>132.38</u>	\$359.38

3. Equipment:

Sequoia National Park, ...	\$ 45.65	
Sequoia National Forest, ...	<u>6.20</u>	\$ 51.85

Most of the equipment used was that on hand
used in previous control work of the Forest
Service.

4. Subsistence:

The men furnished their own subsistence.
Inexperienced men were paid \$3.00 per day. Exper-
ienced men were paid \$3.50 per day.

S U M M A R Y O F C O S T S

Labor and Subsistence	\$1,169.37	
Transportation, ...	359.38	
Equipment, ...	<u>51.85</u>	\$1,580.60
Sequoia National Park Allotment, ...		\$1,500.00
Total expenditures from allotment, ...	896.52	<u>896.52</u>
Unexpended balance, ...		\$ 603.48
Sequoia National Forest Allotment, ...		\$ 700.00
Total expenditures from allotment, ...	684.08	<u>684.08</u>
Unexpended balance, ...		\$ 15.92

(Note: Due to a change in Mr. J.M. Miller's
plans, part of the area in the Park
was not worked.)

TREES CUT.

Number of Trees Cut, ... ~~128~~ 133

Yellow Pine---87

Sugar Pine ---~~43~~ 45

Jeffrey Pine-- 1

Average Diameter, ... ^{34.4}
~~34.2~~ inches

Yellow Pine---~~31.6~~ inches ^{31.9"}

Sugar Pine---~~39.2~~ " ^{38.2"}

Average Cost per Tree, ... ^{11.88}
\$ ~~12.340~~

Average Cost per M.B.M., ... ^{4.13}
\$ ~~4.27~~

Average Feet B.M. per Tree, ... ²⁸⁶⁸
~~2,892~~

Av. of Yellow Pine---~~2,464~~ ²⁴⁰⁹

" " Sugar Pine---~~4,044~~ ³⁷⁷⁸

RALPH HOPPING

National Forest Examiner.